ORIGINAL



LEWIS ROCA

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

2001 DEC 10 P 4: 20

AZ CORP COMMISSION GOODKENT CONTROL

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

WILLIAM A. MUNDELL Chairman

JAMES M. IRVIN Commissioner

MARC SPITZER Commissioner Arizona Corporation Commission DOCKETED

DEC 1 0 2001

DOCKETED BY

IN THE MATTER OF U S WEST COMMUNICATIONS, INC.'S COMPLIANCE WITH § 271 OF THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1996 Docket No. T-00000A-97-0238

COMMENTS OF WORLDCOM, INC. ON REPORT ADDRESSING QWEST'S STAND ALONE TEST ENVIRONMENT

WorldCom, Inc., on behalf of its regulated subsidiaries, ("WorldCom") submits the following comments on the SATE Summary Evaluation Report ("SATE Report"), Version 2.0, release date of December 3, 2001, prepared by Hewlett-Packard ("HP"). WorldCom has also reviewed AT&T's comments on the SATE Report and concurs in comments and concerns.

1233918.1



A. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>

The requirement for a stand-alone test environment for testing of Qwest's operation support systems ("OSS") is found in the overall requirement that Qwest develop an adequate change management plan. In evaluating Qwest's change management plan ("CMP"), Qwest must demonstrate: (1) that information relating to the CMP is clearly organized and readily accessible to competing carriers; (2) that CLECs had substantial input in the design and continued operation of the CMP; (3) that the CMP defines a procedure for the timely resolution of change management disputes; (4) the availability of a stable testing environment that mirrors production; and (5) the efficacy of the documentation that Qwest makes available for the purpose of building an electronic gateway. After determining whether Qwest's CMP is adequate, the FCC will evaluate whether Qwest has demonstrated a pattern of compliance with this plan. ¹

As stated in the SATE Report, Qwest commissioned HP to evaluate its IMA-EDI Stand Alone Test Environment ("SATE"). HP's primary objective is to provide an evaluation of SATE that is unbiased, factual and representative of the experience that a CLEC would face in using SATE for Interoperability testing to establish an IMA-EDI interface with Qwest. In addition, HP's objective is to determine whether the SATE provides an adequate means of testing and support to CLECs seeking to compete in the Arizona marketplace.

¹ See, FCC 271 orders, TX Order ¶ 108; Mass. Order ¶ 103; PA Order, App. C, ¶ 42.



Also as noted in the SATE Report, prior to development of the SATE, CLECs in the Arizona local telecommunications market had to rely on Qwest's Interoperability Testing process for production certification and to prepare for new software releases. Interoperability Testing uses production systems. However, it requires that the CLECs use valid account data of live customers for testing purposes, since all transactions are edited against production and legacy systems. This practice is costly, time consuming, and inconvenient for both CLECs and their customers. HP also observed instances in which customer accounts were inadvertently changed. The SATE was developed by Qwest in August of 2001.

Qwest professes that its implementation of SATE will provide the following:

- 1) An end to end test environment
- 2) Meet the requirements of the FCC
- 3) Meet the needs of CLECs

In August 2000, Qwest provided a level of effort assessment against change request #4868276 that was submitted by Eschelon which stated that: "Qwest is currently in the process of creating an end-to-end test environment. Qwest will revisit this issue when that environment is available."

The FCC² found that "Bell Atlantic's change management process provides for a stable testing environment.³ Competing carriers need access to a stable testing

² See, Memorandum Opinion and Order", CC Docket 99-295 Application by Bell Atlantic New York for Authorization Under Section 271 of the Communications Act To Provide In-Region, InterLATA Service in the State of New York, Section 109

A stable testing environment means that no changes by the BOC are permitted after the testing period commences. See generally U S WEST Sept. 27 Letter; NY Attorney General Comments at 17 (describing the importance of testing opportunities for competing carriers).

effectively with Bell Atlantic's OSS, as modified. In addition, prior to issuing a new software release or upgrade, the BOC must provide a testing environment that mirrors the production environment in order for competing carriers to test the new release. If competing carriers are not given the opportunity to test new releases in a stable environment prior to implementation, they may be unable to process orders accurately and unable to provision new customer services without delays. KPMG originally found Bell Atlantic's testing environment "Not Satisfied," specifically noting that the testing environment "did not adequately mirror production capabilities." As the New York Commission suggests, this can result in competing carriers' transactions succeeding in the testing environment but failing in production.

environment to certify that their OSS will be capable of interacting smoothly and

SATE was implemented in an effort to meet CLEC needs as was stated by Qwest in its EDI White Paper document issued June 18, 2001, version 1.01. In that paper, Qwest specifically recognized that [CLECs] Co-Providers felt that their market entry was delayed by limitations of the [then] current EDI Interoperability test process and stated:

Paper versions of orders must always be sent to Qwest prior to testing. Co-Providers cannot attempt a function and get an immediate response. Therefore,

See generally Department of Justice Evaluation at 35 ("testing is necessary to prevent major service disruptions when Bell Atlantic makes changes in its side of the interface").

KPMG Final Report P1-2 at IV-17 (Test P1-2); New York Commission Comments at

New York Commission Comments at 59.



the learning process can be time consuming, and both Qwest and the Co-Providers must have staff to fully review these paper transactions.

- Co-Providers must maintain production accounts for testing as real production systems are called upon during testing. Some providers do not have end-user accounts within Qwest's network. Others are hesitant to run tests on their end-user's accounts.
- Additionally, Interoperability testing has an impact on Qwest's production environment as well, such as the reservation of real telephone numbers and appointments during the testing process.

B. SPECIFIC COMMENTS

1. Areas for Review

As part of the Arizona third party test of Qwest 's OSS, the Psuedo-CLEC was tasked with validating the assertions made by Qwest that implementation of its SATE met FCC requirements and those of CLECs in general. Also, as part of the Arizona third party test was the requirement to impose military style testing or a test until pass philosophy upon the evaluation of SATE.

The Psuedo-CLEC approached its evaluation by developing four critical areas for review:

Documentation

Process



Transaction Testing

CLEC Input

a. <u>Documentation</u>

The documentation reviewed reflected "numerous, relatively minor inaccuracies that HP believes are the result of hasty preparation and poor version control." The end result was the HP was forced to rely heavily on Qwest to understand the nature of the documents. This process is time consuming for both Qwest and CLECs. What is lacking in this report is conclusive evidence that Qwest addressed these inaccuracies and implemented a version control procedure to address changes in the future.

b. Process

The process review resulted in a recommendation that the "SATE process should be formalized and refined to provide an ease of understanding by CLECs and to ensure consistent repeatability." What is critical is the need for Qwest to implement such a formalized process that is not evident in this report.

c. Transaction Testing

The transaction testing results reflected "discrepancies related to business rules consistency between the SATE and production systems." The evidence uncovered reflects that Qwest SATE does not mirror production. Qwest must demonstrate that its SATE mirrors production environment. HP was also unable to verify that a full release testing is available and cannot do so until Qwest's major IMA 9.0 is released in February 2002. This too is a requirement of the FCC.



d. <u>CLEC Input</u>

HP discovered that prior to implementation, Qwest had no formalized means of addressing CLEC concerns. WorldCom was only requested to attend formalized SATE users group sessions beginning in early November 2001.

2. Open Issues

Based upon its initial testing, HP found that the accuracy and consistency of SATE test responses was adequate to support certification. At the time of the SATE Report, 91% of SATE Release 7.0 transactions have either passed the initial test or a re-test. The remaining 9% of SATE Release 7.0 transactions will be retested prior to issuance of HP's final report.

- a. Formal Issue HPSATEEV2002: This issue relates to LSR responses in SATE. Qwest has replied as follows: Qwest believes that the incident identified herein is a documentation issue not an issue that results in SATE responses different from production responses. Qwest will supply updates to the IMA-EDI Implementation Guide documentation to clarify the language regarding "refine their business process." This update was to be provided on November 9th, 2001. This release of the documentation will be evaluated for the Final Report and HP will provide an updated evaluation.
- b. Formal Issue HPSATEEV1001: This issue is related to SATE connectivity when following the processes for "Establishing a Dedicated Circuit" and "Firewall and IA to IA Test Phase" as described in the Guide. Qwest did make updates to the IMA-EDI Implementation Guide in its November 9, 2001 release of the guide. HP reviewed these updates and recommended that Qwest make further clarifications. The most recent response from Qwest

indicates that an updated IMA-EDI Implementation Guide will be delivered on November 30, 2001 to accommodate the HP recommendations. HP will provide an updated evaluation for the Final Report.

- c. To help clarify and expedite the Data Request Process in the future,

 Qwest made changes to both the Data Request Form and the IMA-EDI Implementation

 Guide in accordance with HP's recommendation. These changes were released to the

 community on November 9, 2001. HP reviewed these modifications and recommended

 some minor adjustments. Qwest will provide an updated IMA-EDI Implementation Guide

 with the appropriate modifications on November 30, 2001. HP will evaluate those

 additional changes and provide an updated evaluation for the Final Report.
- d. Add Products/Activities to SATE: The purpose of this evaluation was to ensure that a CLEC could successfully request the addition of a product and associated order activities that are not currently supported by SATE. Additionally, once the product was made available within the SATE the test scenarios provided in the updated Data Document were executed to ensure the expected results of each scenario could be obtained. HP has requested that Qwest add the Unbundled Distribution Loop product to SATE. In the most recent Data Document distribution v7.09 and v8.07 on November 28, 2001, Qwest has added the UDL and UDLNP products and their associated test scenarios. HP is in the process of preparing for the evaluation of all of the UDL scenarios for both IMA EDI release 7.0 and 8.0. This evaluation will be completed and presented in the Final Report.



- e. Full Regression Testing: The purpose of Full Regression Testing is a quality assurance test based on the multiple changes that HP requested during the aforementioned evaluation methods. HP is executing each scenario supplied in the SATE as documented in the v7.8 and v8.6. The outcome of each transaction will be balanced to the expected result listed in the respective Data Document. All variances will be reported to Qwest. The results of this test will be made available in the Final Report.
- f. HP will confirm the SATE returns consistent responses (inconclusive result). This has been noted as an "Inconclusive rating" as HP is formalizing the results. HP has noted discrepancies in responses during multiple release testing. HP has results that show the same scenario to produce different outcomes when comparing the results of 7.0 to the results of 8.0. HP is currently investigating the extent of this issue. These results will be provided in the Final Report.
- g. Although HP highlights a number of "unsatisfactory results" in its table 5.6.3, there is no evidence in this report that satisfactory results must be made prior to completion of its evaluation. The results are as follows:
 - 1) HP will confirm the SATE test data is valid
 - 2) HP will confirm that the SATE business rules are consistent with the rules published in the Qwest Network Disclosure Document
 - 3) HP will confirm the results of a scenario in SATE will match that scenario's results in production



1

3 4

5

6 7

8

9 10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

These issues are critical and must be resolved to satisfaction prior to the issuance of a final report.

C. **CONCLUSION**

There are many unresolved issues in this initial report. Because "military style" testing or "test until pass" philosophy is being employed, WorldCom expects that no issue will go unresolved upon issuance of a final report. As well, the critical nature of an end-toend test environment has been noted by the requirements imposed by the FCC and emphasized by the CLEC community in Qwest territory. CLECs have not only pushed to have a sufficient end-to-end test environment but have jumped on board when called upon to provide industry input. All outstanding issues must be resolved prior to the completion of HPs evaluation.

Finally, Qwest implemented its SATE without meaningful input from CLECs and continues to change the test environment without using the formalized change management process. Since a SATE is a critical element of the change management process, CLEC input should be requested in the change management process. That forum exists and is up and running.

RESPECTFULLY submitted this 10th day of December, 2001.

LEWIS AND ROCA LLP

Thomas H. Campbell

40 N. Central Avenue

Phoenix, Arizona 85007 Telephone (602) 262-5723



2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

2122

23

2425

26

- AND -

Thomas F. Dixon WorldCom, Inc. 707 – 17th Street, #3900 Denver, Colorado 80202 Telephone: (303) 390-6206

Attorneys for WorldCom, Inc.

ORIGINAL and ten (10) copies of the foregoing filed this 10th day of December, 2001, with:

Arizona Corporation Commission Docket Control – Utilities Division 1200 W. Washington Street Phoenix, Arizona 85007

COPY of the foregoing handdelivered this 10th day of December, 2001, to:

Maureen Scott Legal Division Arizona Corporation Commission 1200 W. Washington Street Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Jane Rodda, Administrative Law Judge Arizona Corporation Commission 1200 W. Washington Street Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Ernest Johnson, Director Utilities Division Arizona Corporation Commission 1200 W. Washington Street Phoenix, Arizona 85007



COPY of the foregoing mailed 1 this 10th day of December, 2001, to: 2 Lyndon J. Godfrey 3 Vice President – Government Affairs AT&T Communications of the Mountain States 4 111 West Monroe, Suite 1201 Phoenix, Arizona 85003 5 6 Scott Wakefield Residential Utility Consumer Office 2828 N. Central Avenue Phoenix, Arizona 85004 8 Mark Dioguardi 9 Tiffany and Bosco PA 500 Dial Tower 1850 N. Central Avenue 10 Phoenix, Arizona 85004 11 Richard M. Rindler Swidler & Berlin 12 3000 K. Street, N.W. Suite 300 13 Washington, DC 20007 14 Maureen Arnold US West Communications, Inc. 15 3033 N. Third Street Room 1010 16 Phoenix, Arizona 85012 17 Jeffrey W. Crockett 18 Snell & Wilmer One Arizona Center 19 Phoenix, Arizona 85004-0001 Richard P. Kolb 20 Vice President - Regulatory Affairs **OnePoint Communications** 21 Two Conway Park 150 Field Drive, Suite 300 22 Lake Forest, Illinois 60045 23 Andrew O. Isar 24 4312 92nd Avenue N.W. Gig Harbor, Washington 98335 25

26



Darren S. Weingard 1 Stephen H. Kukta Sprint Communications Co., L.P. 1850 Gateway Drive, 7th Floor 2 San Mateo, CA 94404-2467 3 4 Timothy Berg Fennemore, Čraig, P.C. 3003 N. Central Avenue 5 **Suite 2600** Phoenix, Arizona 85012-3913 6 7 Charles Steese Owest 1801 California Street, Ste. 5100 8 Denver, Colorado 80202 9 Joan S. Burke Osborn & Maledon 10 2929 N. Central Avenue 21st Floor 11 Phoenix, Arizona 85067-6379 12 Richard S. Wolters AT&T & TCG 13 1875 Lawrence Street **Suite 1575** 14 Denver, Colorado 80202 15 Michael M. Grant Todd C. Wiley 16 Gallagher & Kennedy 2575 E. Camelback Road 17 Phoenix, AZ 85016-4240 18 Raymond S. Heyman Michael Patten 19 Roshka Heyman & DeWulf Two Arizona Center 20 400 Fifth Street **Suite 1000** 21 Phoenix, Arizona 85004 22 Diane Bacon, Legislative Director Communications Workers of America 5818 North 7th Street 23 Suite 206 24 Phoenix, Arizona 85014-5811

25



Bradley Carroll, Esq. 1 Cox Arizona Telcom, L.L.C. 1550 West Deer Valley Road 2 Phoenix, Arizona 85027 3 Joyce Hundley United States Department of Justice Antitrust Division 4 1401 H Street, N.W. **Suite 8000** 5 Washington, D.C. 20530 6 Daniel Waggoner Davis Wright Tremaine 7 2600 Century Square 8 15011 Fourth Avenue Seattle, Washington 98101-1688 9 Alaine Miller NextLink Communications, Inc. 500 108th Avenue NE, Suite 2200 10 Bellevue, Washington 98004 11 Mark N. Rogers 12 Excell Agent Services, LLC 2175 W. 14th Street 13 Tempe, Arizona 85281 14 Traci Grundon Davis Wright Tremaine LLP 15 1300 S.W. Fifth Avenue Portland, Oregon 97201 16 Mark P. Trinchero 17 Davis Wright Tremaine LLP 1300 S.W. Fifth Avenue, Suite 2300 18 Portland, Oregon 97201 19 Gena Doyscher Global Crossing Local Services, Inc. 20 1221 Nicollet Mall Minneapolis, Minnesota 55403-2420 21 Penny Bewick 22 New Edge Networks, Inc. P.O. Box 5159 23 Vancouver, WA 98668 24 25



Jon Loehman 1 Managing Director-Regulatory 2 SBC Telecom, Inc. 5800 Northwest Parkway Suite 135, Room I.S. 40 3 San Antonio, TX 78249 4 M. Andrew Andrade 5261 S. Quebec Street 5 Suite 150 Greenwood Village, CO 80111 6 7 Douglas Hsiao Rhythms Links Inc. 9100 E. Mineral Circle 8 Englewood, CO 80112 9 Karen Clauson Eschelon Telecom, Inc. 730 2nd Avenue South 10 **Suite 1200** 11 Minneapolis MN 55402 12 **Brian Thomas** Vice President Regulatory - West 13 Time Warner Telecom, Inc. 520 S.W. 6th Avenue 14 Suite 300 Portland, Oregon 97204 15 Andrea P. Harris 16 Senior Manager, Regulatory Allegiance Telecom, Inc. of Arizona 17 2101 Webster, Suite 1580 18 Oakland, CA 94612 19 20 21 22 23 24

25